DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 359 UD 007 845

By-Lopate, Carol; And Others

Some Effects of Parent and Community Participation on Public Education. ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 3, February 1969.

Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Feb 69
Contract-OEC-0-9-420088-2327(010)
Note-50p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.60
Descriptors-Child Development, Community Influence, Community Schools, *Decentralization, *Decision Making, *Individual Power, Minority Group Children, *Parent Participation, *School Community Relationship, Self Concept
Identifiers-Coleman Report

This review paper on the current issue of school decentralization points out that it has been consistently demonstrated that participation in the decision making process results in positive changes in both the affective and instrumental behavior of participants. Studies show that parent involvement in the schools enhances children's development and academic achievement. The invidious sense of powerlessness felt by minority group parents and children in dealing with such middle class institutions as the schools would be lessened if they actively participated in the decisions affecting a significant part of their lives. Concomitantly, an improved self concept and greater sense of fate control, leading to changes in the child's aspirations, attitudes, and motivation, would increase academic achievement. Moreover, strengthening the integrity of the neighborhood school and the community would also serve to enhance child development. The minority group child's heightened self worth and sense of control over his destiny (mentioned in the Coleman Report as such an important element in school success) would be encouraged by his awareness of the participation of parents and community groups in effecting changes in educational policy and programs. (NH)

ED027359

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

07845 E

ERIC-IRCD URBAN DISADVANTAGED SERIES

Number 3, February 1969

SOME EFFECTS OF PARENT AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION ON PUBLIC EDUCATION

Carol Lopate
Erwin Flaxman
Effie M. Bynum
Edmund W. Gordon

UD 007 845

ERIC INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027

February 1969

This paper is one of a series of bibliographies and review papers produced by the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged under Contract OEC-0-9-420088-2327 (010) between the U.S. Office of Education and Teachers College, Columbia University.

This position paper has been assigned the ERIC-IRCD accession number UD 007845. After it is announced in Research in Education, the monthly index to ERIC acquisitions, additional copies may be obtained through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland, 20014.

February 1969

Summary

Although a goal of the public schools in the United States has been education for participation in a democratic society, large-city school systems like New York's have left individual citizens and low-level professionals with little voice in the development of educational policy and programs. Schools have been consolidated into districts and then into large school systems as a means of equalizing educational opportunity, raising professional standards, and creating more efficient administrative systems. However, studies of large-city school systems indicate that they are not readily adaptable to change since centralized control has often led to a sense of powerlessness at all levels of the administrative structure. Gittell (1965), analyzing the roles of the major decision-makers in the New York City school system, shows that there is no effective distribution of decision-making authority in these schools. A number of other investigators have documented the powerlessness that school staff feel in making their demands known or in participating in decisions in which they have expertise and which affect their professional roles. Many low-income and minority group parents feel locked out of the school system's decision-making network, an alienation which is particularly intolerable now when they are insisting that the schools are not teaching their children adequately.

The issue of decentralizing the New York City public schools has arisen largely because the participating groups of children, parents, teachers, principals, and administrators have grown too large for effective participation. The importance of participatory decision-making in bringing about positive changes in both the affective and instrumental behavior of participants has been consistently demonstrated. A number of industrial and school system studies indicate that group satisfaction, morale, production, and participation are negatively correlated with the largeness of a group. For example, investigations by Flanders (1951) and Faw (1949) indicate that in student-centered, democratic, or participatory classrooms there is less hostility toward the teacher, less tension among the students, and sometimes even greater actual learning; a study by Flizak (1967) indicates that the degree to which a teacher is able to participate in school decision-making affects her interaction with her students; Hornstein, et al (in press) report that teachers indicate greatest satisfaction with their principal and school system when they perceive that they and their principal are mutually influential; and Cloward and Jones (1963) found the involvement of parents in school affairs to be positively correlated with their evaluations of the importance of education and their attitudes toward the schools as an institution.

Parent involvement in the schools has also been shown to enhance their children's development, particularly their academic achievement. Schiff (1963) reports that parent participation and coopera-

tion in school affairs lead to greater pupil achievement, better school attendance and study habits, and fewer discipline problems. Rankin (1967) found differences between the ability of mothers of high achievement and low achievement inner-city children to discuss school matters and initiate conferences with school officials. Brookover, et al (1965) found that low achieving junior high school students whose parents had become involved in the school and made more aware of the developmental process of their children showed heightened self-concept and made significant academic progress. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) report that children who profited from positive changes in teachers' expectations of their ability all had parents who had demonstrated some interest in their child's development and who were distinctly visible to the teachers. In the Rough Rock, Arizona, community school the involvement of parents and the community in the determination of school policy has triggered student enthusiasm for learning.

Many researchers agree that minority group parents and their children tend to feel powerless in dealing with middle-class institutions such as schools. However, participation in school or other social-political institutions may give parents a greater sense of control, which in turn is conveyed to their children. The Coleman Report (1966) indicates that the child's sense of control over his environment may be more important to his achievement than the characteristics of his school, and that black chil-

dren show considerably less confidence in their ability to control their environment than do white children. Changes in the child's aspirations, attitudes, and motivation which result from the child's heightened self-concept and greater sense of fate control could then lead to his better achievement.

Educators and parents concerned with quality education are now emphasizing the importance of strengthening the integrity of the neighborhood school and the community it serves as a means of enhancing child development. The findings of recent studies suggest that community and ethnic identity may be an important factor promoting a child's success in school. Data from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission study Racial Isolation in the Public Schools (1967) show that, although achievement was greatest in predominantly white integrated schools, students in 90 percent segregated schools in black neighborhoods had higher achievement scores than those attending schools with an approximately 50/50 ethnic population, and Greeley and Rossi (1966) conclude that the "religio-ethnic" identity provided by the ghetto atmosphere of the Catholic schools is an important correlate of student achievement.

These findings suggest that when parents are involved in the decision-making processes of education, their children are likely to do better in school. This increased achievement may be due to the lessening of distance between the goals of the school and the goals of the home and to the changes in teachers' attitudes resulting from their greater sense of accountability when the parents of

the child are visible in the schools. It may also be related to the increased sense of control the child feels over his own destiny and to a greater sense of his own worth when he sees his parents actively engaged in decision-making in his school. Very important for this achievement is the heightened community integrity and ethnic group self-esteem which can be enhanced through parent and community groups effecting changes in educational policy and programs.

SOME EFFECTS OF PARENT AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION ON PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Democratic Process in Education

Although one of the traditional goals of education in this country has been to prepare citizens for participation in a democratic society, public education in large cities in the United States has been characterized by centralization, standardization, and professionalization which allow for little democratic participation. In general, the moves toward centralization in both urban and rural areas have been progressive in their intent: centralization has been a means of equalizing educational opportunity, raising professional standards and creating efficient and economical systems. In some instances, however, increased centralization has been the result of political momentum rather than educational planning and of an unquestioned faith in the efficiency of accumulated power at a single point.

Three questions are inherent in any evaluation of a centralized or decentralized political system: 1) to what extent are the primary needs and expressed wishes of clients of the system represented in its process? 2) are their identification and involvement with the process advanced or retarded? and 3) is the system maximally efficient in accomplishing its purpose? In education, since the goals are largely defined in terms of preparing individuals for functioning in a democratic society, the three questions are largely interrelated.

Just as our federal government was founded on the Jeffersonian principle that the welfare of the citizens could best be served by preserving local and state initiative, so, too, public education originated with the belief that it should be grounded in local decision-making and local effort. This principle is reflected in legislative acts in the late eighteenth century which provided that the primary schools be locally managed by representatives of the public, and that the College of William and Mary be run by a board ultimately responsible to the legislature (Cremin, 1965).

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, individual towns ran their own schools and taxed their citizens accordingly. However, as people moved out from the immediate towns, they began to find attending the town school inconvenient, and the rural citizenry balked at the idea of taxation for schools which their children did not use. A temporary solution was found in the "moving schools," which were established throughout the states in the latter part of the eighteenth century. These schools, taught by a teacher who divided her year among three or four locations, formed the basis of school districts. With the passage of a Massachusetts law in 1789, these districts were allowed to tax themselves, thus extending educational taxation beyond the town.

These autonomous districts, however, had widely varying educational standards, and in the 1820's and '30's a number of religious and intellectual leaders began to attribute the "lag" in

American education to a lack of systematic control. It was often said that "the Prussians are getting ahead of us," and that this was due to their highly centralized system of education. In 1837 the Whig government passed a centralization bill enabling state boards of education to "collect and diffuse information"--in itself a rather inconsequential move toward the centralization of power. However, a zealous secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education used his position to berate the local districts for saving money on education and urged state fiscal leadership. His argument for state aid to localities on a matching basis formed a model which is prevalent in many phases of state support for local programs to this day.

The politicalization of school decision-making through centralization of authority is by now well known. As towns grew and became consolidated, their school districts were consolidated with them. Since this was generally accomplished by taking on all the previously independent districts' board members, school board membership grew to amazing numbers. By the 1880's and '90's, some numbered as many as 110 individuals. Graft and other corruption were prevalent, as neither local citizenry, state, nor even federal authorities could exercise any control.

It is not surprising, therefore, that concerned citizens at the turn of the century began to argue for the need to separate education from politics. They called for standardization of the system and centralization of control; centralized auditing, the

merit system, civil service examinations were suggested as means of eliminating the corruption which had begun to undermine educational administration, particularly in the large cities. The idea was to invest a few individuals--preferably those already respected by their constituents--with responsibility for the functioning of the system; although freed from political manipulations, these individuals would still be in the public eye. Public censure or acclamation would serve as a powerful corrective agent.

The distance of the administrators of public schools from the lay public they served increased further as a result of several concomitant developments:

1) The beginning of the twentieth century was marked by a strong move toward the professionalization of teaching, and the first step in this process was the opening of teacher-training institutions and education courses in universities. As teachers received the status of professionals with greater specialized training, they began to view the lay public as unqualified to make educational decisions.

2) Following World War I, the enormous growth in school population--at a time when students were attending school for more years--put great pressure on the schools to develop richer programs at lower costs. Innumerable districts were consolidated. The bus was instituted to transport students from wide areas. At the state level, special departments arose to develop curriculum publications, workshops in instructional materials, and conferences

on the latest pedagogical techniques.

3) The rise of large cities filled increasingly by low-income and minority groups, who had little ability to deal with established political and social power structures, enabled the educational bureaucracy to act without accountability to its constituents. At the same time, middle-class populations in the suburbs became increasingly satisfied with nominal control over their schools through elections of superintendents or unofficial pressure groups based on the prestige of the parents in the communities (Minar, 1962; and Kerr, 1964).

4) The increasing intervention of the federal government in public education has imposed changes on schools which have not always responded to the expressed needs of their constituents. Not only have funds supported specific programs, such as vocational training, elementary and secondary science education, and projects for the training and retraining of teachers and counselors, but Supreme Court decisions have altered the character of United States education--first by slowly revising the relations between public and denominational education, and then by changing, to varying degrees, the ethnic composition of public schools in the South and in Northern cities (Cremin, 1965).

Many communities, particularly in the South, have resisted federal influence in education. However, most educators judge such intervention as the most viable means of standardizing educational opportunity while at the same time, at least potentially,

leaving a wide latitude of freedom to local educational planning. The federal government has tended to have less prominent vested interests in the majority power structure of individual communities, and it has been able to show greater sensitivity to the collective political power of minority groups distributed over a number of political subdivisions (Coleman, 1967). However, state and federal governments have worked most effectively when supported by majority interests of the community; when the majority interests have resisted such support of minorities, more state or federal effort and risk have been required than have been customarily taken.

Except in those instances where the federal government has been forced to move to protect the interests of minority groups, the increased centralization of educational planning has served the interests of the status quo, rather than those of minority populations. Consolidated schools, coordination of education through state departments, federal assistance and leadership have improved the quality of education for middle-class children, while remaining rather ineffective means of improving education for poor and ethnic minority group children. These children and their parents have had little identification and only modest involvement in the educational process; they have not participated nor even been represented in education or in the social-political life of their nation.

The situation in New York City reflects the ultimate stage in the alienation of poor minority groups from the centralized bureaucratic structure of public education. Although objective investigation at times appears unwelcome, if not impossible, structural and administrative problems of the public school system provide a case study for the exploration of the possibilities and limits of democratic representation and participation in education.

Centralization and Participation in the New York City Public School System

The history of the sprawling New York City school system begins with the consolidation in 1897 of what had formerly been the City of New York (Manhattan and the Bronx), the City of Brooklyn, the Borough of Queens, and the Borough of Richmond or Staten Island. The Charter of 1897 provided for four relatively weak boards of education in the five boroughs (Manhattan and the Bronx were kept together) and a Central Board of Education, consisting of 19 delegates from the borough boards, with substantial executive powers.

This arrangement was superseded by a Charter in 1901 which eliminated the borough boards, creating instead 46 local school boards whose duties were largely administrative. The Central Board of Education remained much the same, however. Selected from representatives of the five boroughs, totaling 46 members, it was supreme in all matters of public education.

A third change in 1917 stripped the local boards of all power except reporting to the Central Board on specified matters within their districts, and at the same time reduced the constituency of the Central Board to seven, an obvious response to its previous unwieldy size. An equally important indication of the increasing flow of authority from the top down was the fact that the Central Board members, "representing" the five boroughs, were now to be appointed by the Mayor.

This power structure was examined by the Commissioner of Education, Frank P. Graves, in a comprehensive evaluation of the New York school system in 1933. Graves found that the major trend in the school system was toward increased centralization of authority and responsibility, and that the Board of Education now had broad powers over all phases of public education in New York City. He maintained:

> ...the local autonomy characteristic of the ward trustee or the local committee system has nearly disappeared. The only vestige of this local control is the local school board, which as now constituted has little real authority (Graves, 1933).

According to Graves, "if the sprawling system was to be run effectively and efficiently, it seemed necessary to consolidate various functions and to define at various levels of the hierarchy the administrative supervisory functions and determine lines of authority." Graves' recommendations concentrated on a larger delegation of authority by the Central Board to other groups: from the superintendent of schools, the associate superintendents and district superintendents, the local boards, supervisors, principals and teachers (New York State Education Department, 1967).

Until 1961, however, the structure of the New York public school system remained essentially the same while the city continued to grow. But the 44-year period between 1917 and 1961 did not pass without intensive analyses of the increasing chaos. Moreover, each successive investigation showed that the situation was more critical, and each investigator more willingly advocated radical change.

In the late 1930's and 1940's Mort and Cornell conducted a number of studies on school administration and formulated an important measure of the effectiveness of school systems. From their research they maintained that the educational quality of school districts could be measured by their adaptability to change; curricular innovations, new types of classes and classroom structures were among the variables indicating this capacity. Using adaptability as an index, Mort and Cornell found correlations between a district's adaptability rating and such characteristics as its financial policies, its size, and the degree of lay and professional participation in the district. In fact, according to their studies, two-thirds of the variance between adaptive and non-adaptive school districts could be ascertained without even going into the schools (Mort and Cornell, 1941). In a similar investigation which dealt with the problems of the big-city school, Mort and Vincent state:

> Education in many ways is hampered in the large city, because here, as nowhere else among American schools, education is centrally controlled. It is as though the schools of your village were run by somebody way off at the state capital. You have no voice, no control, your questions go unanswered, your demands on the local administrator are parried by: "I'm sorry, but that matter is completely out of my hands; you will have to go to headquarters." But you can never get close enough to the man at headquarters who makes the decisions, and you give up (Mort and Vincent, 1946).

After Cillé (1940), in a study of school organization, had related bigness to inflexibility and powerlessness at all levels of the administrative structure, studies by Mort and Cornell

on school administration pinpointed the maximum effective school district size as being 100,000. This estimate was supported by Leggett and Vincent (1947) in their study comparing New York City schools with other school systems, as well as by Ross (1958).

As evidence mounted that school district size could limit or enhance the quality of education, investigators began to look into the possibility of community initiative and control. To them decentralization was a means of increasing the communities' active participation in school affairs, not simply the diffusion of top level initiative. Community control was seen as a way of creating a more flexible and efficient system with greater potential for meeting the needs of individual communities. Hicks (1942) hypothesized:

> Adaptations initiated by the central office will be less well understood and less extensively developed than those which spring from within the community, i.e., they will not over a given period of time have reached (a) the degree of depth, or (b) the extent of spread comparable to those introduced through the force of initiative.
>
> When cities are comparable in size and expenditure, those promoting the greatest extent of local freedom will rank highest in adaptability, and their teachers highest in the understanding of modern educational issues.

But Westby (1947) stated that local autonomy could neither be established nor assured by granting more power only to principals and superintendents. According to him, "the people of the community must have the power to make decisions that will have a real effect on the operations of schools and the means by which these decisions

can be translated into action." Looking at the problem from another point of view, Jansen (1940) noted the absence of local initiative in certain areas of New York City, particularly where apartment houses predominated, and suggested that the public school might provide a unifying force to stimulate initiative.

Bureaucratic and financial problems had become acute by the time the question of reorganizing the New York City public school system came before the State Legislature in 1961. One of the main recommendations made by the Regents and the Commissioner to the Legislature during the reexamination of the system was to revitalize the participation of local school districts. Later in the year the Superintendent of Schools issued the first board-originated plan for decentralizing the public school system. Decentralization, according to the Superintendent's report, would improve the efficiency of the entire school system, relieve central headquarters of increasing burdens, meet more adequately the needs of local areas, and increase citizen interest in the schools. Although the plan was modest, little action was taken until again in 1966 the city government and the Board of Education were forced by community pressure and the State Legislature to produce a viable plan for decentralizing the school system.

The resulting controversies and confusions of the past two years need not be described. But to understand why the administrative structure of the New York public school system has become so ineffective in serving its clients, an analysis of the channels

for control and influence among the dominant educational groups may be useful.

A study by Gittell (1965) analyzes the role of the major decision-makers in the New York City school system. Examining decision-making and administration in five policy areas--budget, curriculum, selection of superintendents, salaries, and integration--Gittell maintains that the public school system lacks channels for effective authority, even at the central level where, ostensibly all the power is now located. The size of the system is one major difficulty: over 3,000 individuals are employed in the central bureaucracy, while the operational field staff includes 2,200 principals and assistant principals, 31 district superintendents, and 740 department chairmen. Another problem stems from over-centralization which makes any innovation difficult, if not impossible to execute.

As examples of the limitation imposed by both size and over-centralization, Gittell analyzes the roles of some major "participating" bodies: 1) The Board of Education, until recently the most powerful body, operates largely to balance conflicting pressures and interests. In the five decision areas measured by Gittell, the Board's role ranges from superficial participation (budget) to formulation of policies with failure to execute them (integration), to early negotiation followed by inability to carry through on responsibility (teachers' salaries), to its most direct role, the selection of a superintendent. 2) The superintendent of schools

has nominal power in a number of areas, but because he is usually someone who has risen within the New York school hierarchy, he is unlikely to take a position different from that of the general bureaucracy. Constraints by the Board of Education limit him further in instituting change. 3) Local school boards have almost no authority in the determination of school policy; usually they play the role of community buffers, holding hearings and discussing narrow local issues. 4) District superintendents make no decisions regarding the distribution of funds and have only limited discretion in assignment of personnel; mainly they operate as buffers for parent dissatisfaction that remains unresolved by the school principal. 5) The teachers' union, which has shown far greater power in the last two years than it had at the time of the Gittell study still remains a promoter of "professional interests" (job security, salaries, etc.) and avoids entering such areas as curriculum development or instructional methods, where they are actually qualified. A final example, local and civic groups such as the UPA or the PEA have little effect on decision-making; even their potential power as pressure groups is usually lost because of the time and red tape involved in getting any action. And in the recent attempts to integrate the public schools, civil rights pressure groups also lost most of their momentum through delays by the bureaucracy.

Of particular interest is the manner in which decisions about curriculum are made, since they most intimately affect the clients

served by the school. A small cadre of professional administrators is responsible for curriculum development and change, which is made every 3 years during a rushed period before books and materials must be ordered. Although meaningful curriculum should incorporate new ideas and flexibility, the closed bureaucratic structure of the New York City school system restricts innovation because the very persons who know how curriculum should be developed--curriculum specialists, principals and teachers--do not participate. The decision-makers who stand at the top of the hierarchical structure are too far removed from their student-clients at the lowest point to be either responsive or accountable to their needs. The large number of black and Puerto Rican children in the schools has not stimulated broad revisions; rather, they continue to be taught from a curriculum geared to the assumed culture and learning style of white middle-class youth.

Once a program has been developed, curriculum coordinators and their assistants present guidelines for its implementation to the principal, who is responsible for integrating it into the school's existing curriculum and introducing it to his teachers. But, because of his limited ability in this area and his restricted time for teacher training, the principal transfers his responsibility to the teachers; however, in practice, neither principal nor teacher significantly expands or modifies the guidelines. Thus, administrators external to the school and classroom formally initiate policy and informally influence its implementation.

Such a hierarchical communication system leaves its members without effective control. A number of investigations have documented the powerlessness which school staff--principals, department heads, and teachers--feel because they have no machinery for making their needs known or for participating in decisions in which they are experts and which truly affect them (Becker, 1953; Chesler, 1963; Griffiths, 1963; Willower, 1963; Hornstein, in press). If teachers and principals feel powerless, parents feel even more so because they participate less. And, as Becker has pointed out, although parents may be unable to effect change, their position outside the hierarchy makes them threatening:

> To the teacher, then, the parent appears as an unpredictable and uncontrollable element, as a force which endangers and may even destroy the existing authority system over which she has some measure of control. For this reason, teachers (and principals who abide by their expectations) carry on an essentially secretive relationship vis-a-vis parents and the community, trying to prevent any event which will give these groups a permanent place of authority in the school situation. The emphasis on never admitting mistakes of school personnel to parents is an attempt to prevent these outsiders (who would not be subject to teacher control) from getting any excuse which might justify their intrusion into and possible destruction of the existing authority system.

But parents are now voicing their distress at the inadequacies of education; they maintain that their children cannot identify with the cultural ideology of the school and that the schools have found no way of making this identification possible. The course has come full circle. Whereas centralization and standardization appeared to be a means of committing a vast number of first genera-

tion U.S. Nationals to the ideologies and mores of society in the United States, school decentralization and community control now seem to be means for reaching those members of society who are not served by the present system.

Some Correlates of Organizational Size and Participation in Decision-Making on Group Behavior

The size of a subgroup in any large organization influences opportunities for participation and in turn the satisfaction and performance of its members. The issue of decentralizing the New York City public schools has arisen largely because the existing subgroups--parents, teachers, principals, administrative staff--have proved too large for either active participation or maximum production.

Most studies of group behavior are based on far smaller populations than the approximately one million students, 60,000 teachers, and 6,000 administrators in the New York City school system. This raises the question of even using experimental studies to understand conditions in a system as large as the public schools in New York City. However, despite problems in translating findings from the small samples to the large populations, it is commonly agreed that the processes of small groups can be used as models in understanding large organizations (Verba, 1961).

A number of studies conclude that group satisfaction, morale, production, and participation are functions of the size of the group. Barker and Gump (1964) summarize the findings of industrial, commercial, and social group research, among which some of the following studies are cited. Tallachi (1960) studied 93 industrial organizations and found negative correlations between organizational

size and worker satisfaction, and again between satisfaction and absenteeism. Using various industrial and commercial organizations, the Acton Society Trust studies (1953) pointed to the effects of size on a number of indices of worker morale. Interest in the affairs of the organization and knowledge of the names of administrators decreased as the size of the organization increased, as did voting on work unit issues, subscriptions to professional periodicals, output, and punctuality. On the other hand, the investigators found that acceptance of rumors, absenteeism, accident rates, strikes, and waste increased as the size of the organization increased.

A study of two automobile factories indicated a consistent negative relationship between largeness of the work unit and individual productivity or output (Marriot, 1949). Finally, in an investigation of 96 business organizations, Indik (1961) found that bigness correlated positively with difficulty of maintaining communication among members and negatively with participation.

Although only the Acton Society Trust and Indik studies deal directly with the relationship between size and participation, it is probably a dependent variable in all of them. A number of additional investigations have identified correlations between size and participation. Barker and Gump discovered a consistent correlation between school size and the level and type of participation of the student body and between participation and student morale. Identity crises, for example, were far more prevalent in

the large schools studied. The work of Mort and Cornell (1941) indicates that with school size held relatively constant, even district size can enhance or diminish participation of parent and teacher groups. This finding is relevant to the New York City public school system which will probably continue to have large individual school populations even under a highly decentralized system.

In the United States, participation is popularly accepted as inherently good, and in the last 30 years scientific studies of small group situations have generally supported this attitude from a more objective standpoint. The participation hypothesis maintains that "...significant changes in human behavior can be brought about rapidly only if the persons who are expected to change participate in deciding what the change shall be and how it shall be made" (Simon, 1955). Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) conducted a series of experiments with children and adults fulfilling different tasks under three leadership styles--democratic, laissez-faire, and authoritarian. The investigators found that members of democratic groups who were given an opportunity for maximum participation in decision-making were more satisfied and enthusiastic about the task than members of authoritarian groups and maintained a high level of production. These findings have been replicated in many similar studies in educational and industrial psychology, in training programs in business and government, and

in community planning. Verba, in citing a number of such studies, conjectures that under such situations of participatory decision-making members of the group identify with the task and are reinforced directly by accomplishing it; their rewards come from rational decision-making in approaching the task as well as in greater productivity.

The relevance of degree and legitimacy of participation for satisfaction and production is suggested by two additional studies. To examine the ways of bringing about changes in the methods of production in an industrial firm, Coch and French (1948) created three different work groups. For the control group, changes were introduced by management decision and the members of this group in no way influenced the change in the process of production. A second group, the "partial participation" group, influenced the changes through representatives selected by the group; in the third, the "total participation" group, all the members worked directly in making decisions about changes. It was found that the production of the control group dropped after the changes were introduced and that they became hostile towards management; the partial participation group, however, continued to produce satisfactorily, after a momentary drop in production; and the total participation group quickly exceeded its pre-change rate of production, while remaining satisfied in its job. The study was replicated in a Norwegian factory by French, Israel, and Å̊s in 1960, where the investigators found that production did not increase as a result of the workers having par-

ticipated in decision-making. They attributed this to the fact that decisions in which the groups participated had little relevance to production. These findings suggest the need to distinguish between token and legitimate participation. The studies imply that participants must feel that their participation is meaningful and related to the immediate tasks.

Although the preceding studies have suggested the value of participation on morale and feelings of satisfaction, they have concentrated on the necessity of participation for organizing change and maintaining production. However, research indicates that participation in decision-making enhances both the instrumental and the affective (attitudes and motivation) realms of human behavior in complex organizations.

Investigations by Flanders (1951) and Faw (1949) indicate that in student-centered, democratic, or participatory classrooms, there is less hostility toward the teacher, less tension among the students, and sometimes greater actual learning. In a study by Flizak (1967) of the behavior and attitudes of teachers working in three types of school structures--authoritarian, rationalistic, and humanitarian--the degree to which the teacher was able to participate in school decision-making affected her interaction with her students. Teachers in the authoritarian school structures tended to be rated as disciplinarians and information-givers; those in more rationalistic structures scored higher on motivation of students, while teachers in humanitarian school structures were

viewed as fulfilling a counselor role. Hornstein, et al (in press) reports that teachers indicate greatest satisfaction with their principal and school system when they perceive that they and their principals are mutually influential.

Participation in the school also has been related to parent attitudes and behavior. Cloward and Jones (1963) found the involvement of parents in school affairs to be positively correlated with their evaluations of the importance of education and their attitudes towards the school as an institution. When low-income parents were divided into formal participant, visits only, and no contact groups, formal participants consistently indicated greater agreement than the other groups with such statements as "Getting ahead means obtaining or providing a good education," "Education comes to mind when they think of a good life for boys and for girls," and "Education is the first or second biggest problem in the community." Cloward and Jones suggest that this last attitude can be employed by school administrators to bring about needed improvements in school facilities and programs.

At the present time attitudes and behavior of many groups in the school system indicate the degree of discontent which the existing structure has generated. As the system is now structured, no group is small enough to participate meaningfully in decision-making. From studies such as the ones previously cited, one can hypothesize that if group size were decreased through decentralization, participation could be enhanced for parents, teachers, and administrators alike, creating more productive and more satisfied participants.

The Effects of Parent Involvement in Education on Pupil Development

A child's educational development depends upon a dynamic interaction between the parent and the school. Although this interaction generally has been limited in the public school situation, a number of studies have shown that even circumscribed participation by parents in school affairs has a measurable effect on pupil development.

In a study of the effects of contacts between parents and school personnel on student achievement, Schiff (1963) reports that parent participation and cooperation in school affairs leads to pupil achievement, as well as better school attendance and study habits and fewer discipline problems. An analysis of the gains on a reading test which was administered to experimental and control groups of children revealed that pupils of the experimental (parent participation) group improved to a significantly greater degree than did pupils of the control group.

From personal observations of compensatory programs in various parts of the country, Jablonsky (1968) reports that "schools which have open doors to parents and community members have greater success in educating children. ...The children seem to be direct beneficiaries of the change in perception on the part of their parents."

Hess and Shipman (1966), in a study of the effects of mothers' attitudes and behavior toward their children in test situations, conclude similarly: "Engaging parents in the activities of the school

in some meaningful way may indeed assist the child in developing more adequate and useful images of the school, of the teacher, and of the role of the pupil."

Rankin (1967) investigated the relationship between parent behavior and achievement of inner-city elementary school children and found substantial differences between the attitudes and behavior of mothers of high achievement and low achievement children. The ability of the mothers to discuss school matters and to initiate conferences with school officials were two of the general areas in which differences were most often found.

Brookover, et al (1965) compared the development of three low achieving junior high school student groups: one group received weekly counseling sessions, the second had regular contacts with specialists in particular interest areas, and the parents of the third group had weekly meetings with school officials about their children's development. At the end of the year the first two groups showed no greater achievement as a result of their special treatment. However, the third group, whose parents had become more intimately involved in the school and in their children's development, showed heightened self-concept and made significant academic progress during the year.

Parent involvement in the school not only changes parents' attitudes and behavior but influences teacher attitudes towards children. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) report that children who profited from positive changes in teachers' expectations of their

ability all had parents who were involved to some degree in their child's development in the school and who were distinctly visible to the teachers.

Although parents are for the most part only tangentially involved in the schools, in Rough Rock, Arizona, the Navaho Indian parents and community have votes on all school policy and sit on local school boards. Before parents and other community members obtained control of the schools, the Bureau of Indian Affairs had tried unsuccessfully for many years to increase school achievement and lower the dropout rate. Reports from Rough Rock indicate that involvement of parents in the process of education has triggered student enthusiasm for learning, largely by making the school an integral part of the community and recognizing the importance of native Indian culture (Roessel, 1968).

These investigations suggest several possible hypotheses about the manner in which parent involvement affects pupil development, particularly academic achievement. The parent's participation may make him more visible to both school personnel and the child, which may indicate to both that educational values are upheld by the family. Parent participation at the same time may change the attitudes of the parents towards the schools and towards the goals of education. And as studies such as those by Hess and Shipman indicate, when parents are involved in the process of education, they may come to acquire certain skills of teaching which can then be applied in the home situation.

The active participation of parents in school affairs and other community and political activities may also enhance cultural identity and self-concept, which in turn raise achievement. Stating what many other investigators have felt, Chilman (1966) notes that the parental patterns most characteristic of the very poor are an anticipation of failure and a distrust of middle-class institutions such as schools. Youth in the Ghetto, the classic study of life in central Harlem, documents that children growing up in the inner-city sense almost immediately their parents' feelings of powerlessness and quickly assume that they too have little or no control over their fate (HARYOU-ACT, 1964). In an analysis of the political socialization of blacks, Seasholes (1965) writes:

> In the end, the most serious consequence of Negro frustration and noninvolvement in politics is the possibly deleterious effect on the Negro's own evaluation of himself. The Negro who sees politics as a conspiracy against him may or may not have a low political self-image. The Negro who traces his political insignificance to his own shortcomings does: "They don't care because I am worthless." (author's emphasis)

On the other hand, when parents exercise control or power in the school and community, they convey this sense of control to their children who no longer view themselves as powerless and lacking self-worth.

The importance of this sense of self-worth and individual power cannot be overemphasized. In Equality of Educational Opportunity, the largest study of achievement among minority group children, conducted by the U.S. Office of Education, Coleman, et al (1966)

conclude that the child's sense of control over his environment is one of the strongest factors influencing his achievement. The authors suggest that for children from disadvantaged groups, achievement appears to be influenced by what they believe about their environment: whether they believe it will respond to reasonable efforts or whether it is instead immovable or merely random. The child's sense of control over his environment may be more important to achievement than school characteristics. According to the study, although in important ways the attitudes of black and white students toward school and academic work differ little, the black students are less likely to expect that they will go to college or even obtain a job that will require advanced education. Black children indicate considerably less confidence in their ability to control their environment than do white children. They tend to agree with such statements as: "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life"; "Every time I try to get ahead, something or somebody stops me"; or "Good luck is more important than hard work for success."

The Cloward and Jones study of low-income, working-class, and middle-class families on the Lower East Side of New York City confirms this finding of the effect of minority status and social class on the belief that work and education will result in getting ahead. Although middle-class parents tended to believe that schooling and hard work resulted in success, low-income parents felt that success was largely related to "whom you know" or "luck." However, it is important to note that the Cloward and Jones research stresses that parents of all classes who were involved in the schools were likely

to believe that the school and education could actually effect change in their children. Their participation in the school may have given them a greater sense of fate control than those parents who were not involved in school matters.

The sense of control over one's destiny is only one of a number of affective variables which have been found to significantly influence development. Other related variables--self-esteem, motivation, level of aspiration, peer relationships, teacher attitudes, and the general school and home environments--also are acknowledged as important in the child's development.

Throughout the twentieth century educators have vacillated in the importance they attributed to these affective variables. With the influence of Dewey early in the century, they felt that schools could best teach children by developing them emotionally and socially. This emphasis was shifted after the Sputnik crisis in the 1950's, which created pressure in American education to rapidly produce highly sophisticated and specialized intellectual achievement and cognitive skills. However, in the last few years a number of investigators have become somewhat skeptical about the possibility of significantly influencing performance through changes in basic cognitive processes. They consider it likely that cognitive intervention cannot promote significant changes in the quality of the child's intellectual functioning without changes in his affective processes--aspiration, commitment, motivations, attitudes. Zigler (1966) has suggested that the affective areas of development may be far more amenable to change than the cognitive areas, and that when significant changes in the quality of

intellectual development occur, they may be more related to prior changes in the affective domain than to cognitive intervention. Thus, he and others have tended to deemphasize the need to create new learning devices and have focused on changing the learning environment and improving the relationship between school, family, community, and ethnic reference group.

One affective area which shows potential for enhancing the performance of low-income and minority group children is the improved self-concept resulting from active parent participation in the school. It is now felt that parent involvement can make the child's school and home life more integrated and provide him with a model of participation and control in a major area of his life. School can become more relevant and its goals possible to achieve.

Community Identity and Educational Achievement

Since the 1954 Supreme Court school desegregation decision educators have focused on changes in school ethnic composition as one means of creating quality education for minority group children. Communities have responded to the demands of the courts for desegregation with a series of plans and programs: open enrollment, busing, rezoning, school site selection, and school construction (including educational parks and complexes). Most of these plans have been partially achieved, at best. Busing, for example, has generally resulted in a one-way flow out of the ghetto school and into the middle-class white school with little or no reciprocation and relatively little integration within the white school. St. John (1968) and others have pointed out that "resegregation" has occurred through tracking as well as through the white exodus from the cities to the suburbs. In New York City and other large urban areas, the departure of white families has left the schools with large proportions of youngsters from black and Puerto Rican homes. The possibility of instituting any meaningful degree of school integration is becoming unlikely, particularly in the absence of enthusiasm for metropolitan as opposed to city-bound school districts.

Recognizing the ineffectiveness of past efforts to integrate the schools, both educators and minority group parents now accept that the neighborhood school will continue to exist and may even have

intrinsic value. Thus, those concerned with quality education emphasize the importance of strengthening the integrity of the neighborhood school and the community it serves. School integration as a priority has been put aside, at least for the moment.

Such a decision may appear regressive, considering the number of studies which have shown educational achievement to be higher in integrated than in segregated schools. However, there are several correlates of this better achievement which indicate that the integrated school may not be the only setting in which the achievement of minority group children can be raised. For example, the finding of Coleman and others that the black child's sense of control over his fate was greater in the integrated environment may indicate that those children who attended integrated schools had parents who actively worked towards achieving integrated education for their children, and thereby acted as models for fate control. Achievement in integrated schools is likely to have been enhanced because these schools, being in better neighborhoods, are also generally better equipped and have staff who themselves do not feel "deprived" by their working environments. Finally, black children attending integrated schools are generally from families of higher socioeconomic status than those in segregated schools.

A number of studies suggest that, while largely white schools with a small proportion of minority groups may be an optimal situation for producing school achievement, the value of community and

group integrity has been severely underplayed. Data from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission study, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools (1967), show that, although achievement was greatest in the predominantly white integrated schools, students in 90 percent "segregated" schools in black neighborhoods had higher achievement scores than those attending schools with an approximately 50-50 ethnic composition.

A study of juvenile delinquency rates in various tracts in Baltimore sheds light on the effects of community integrity from another vantage point (Lander, 1954). Controlling for economic factors identified by such variables as deteriorated housing, low rentals and overcrowding, Lander found that delinquency rates increased as the proportion of blacks in a neighborhood went from eight to 50 per 100. However, as the black population increased beyond 50 percent, black delinquency rates tended to decrease, with the areas of 90 percent or more having the lowest rates. According to Lander delinquency in Baltimore is fundamentally related to the anomie of a neighborhood and conversely a lack of delinquency is related to neighborhood stability and identity.

From an analysis of the academic achievement of Catholic children, Greeley and Rossi (1966) conclude that "religio-ethnic" identity provided by the ghetto atmosphere of the Catholic schools is an important correlate of student performance. The educational achievement and later job success of Catholics who attended parochial schools compared favorably with that of other Catholics who attended

the best public schools in the country. This high achievement can be attributed to the dedication of the Catholic teacher; the students may also be motivated to achieve through the group identification and pride which the school encourages. The authors maintain that their findings "call into serious question the assumption that it is necessary, for the health of society, that the religious and religic-ethnic ghettos be eliminated." Greeley and Rossi hypothesize that the identity provided by these ghettos may work not only to promote achievement, but also to further the Catholic child's general acceptance of individuals from various ethnic groups. "In the long run, [the ghettos] may even promote greater tolerance, because they give a person a relatively secure social location and a fairly clear answer to the difficult question, 'Who am I?'"

A report on the "Education of American Indian Children" summarizes research pointing to the need for self-determination and self-sufficiency of the American Indian which creates the psychological well-being necessary for successful learning (Gaarder, 1967). The author's recommendations are based on

> ...the principle of self-determination (including the choice of language) and the belief that the only road of development of a people is that of self-development, including the right to make its own decisions and its own poems and stories, revere its own gods and heroes, choose its leaders and depose them--in short, to be human its own way and demand respect for that way.

By the time the child enters school he has already developed an individual and cultural identity; in the case of minority group

and low-income children, this identity has been viewed as a disadvantage. One of the reasons why these children have been considered "culturally" or "educationally disadvantaged" is that the schools have been less successful in educating them than they have in educating middle-class children. Educators have assumed that one instructional system could be applied to all children--with not even the tribute of respect paid to minority cultures--and that the success of all children could only be measured in terms of their adaptability to the uniform standards implicit in this system. The inability of the "disadvantaged" students to profit from even such special arrangements as the various compensatory education programs may be due to the actual irrelevance which the curriculum and instruction has had to their lives as well as to the alienation of these children and their parents from the procedures of the school.

Thus, in order for the schools to be maximally effective, change may be needed in the school and in the relationship between the school and the community: education must be made more relevant to the students, and community and cultural integrity must be recognized. Community-originated and community-controlled education provides one means of effecting needed change. Local control should enable the communities to identify their special needs and to legitimately change the schools to meet them.

Conclusion

Although the democratic tradition of this nation presupposes that citizens will actively participate in political decision-making, political and administrative momentum has often led to increased centralization of power, varying degrees of representation rather than participation, and often the alienation of citizens from decisions which affect their lives. In education, the rise of big city school systems has widened the gulf between decision-makers and those affected by the decisions, and many school systems are now too large to sensitively administer to the needs of their clients. In New York City, particularly, the social and political distance between the growing population of black and Puerto Rican families and the educational decision-makers has shown the shortcomings of a highly centralized bureaucratic decision-making process. These groups feel they have little access to power in educational and other social-political institutions, and as they have found the public school ineffective in fulfilling their needs, they have become unwilling and at times hostile second-class participants in society.

Investigations of the effects of participatory decision-making in creating positive changes in both the affective and instrumental behavior of the participants consistently demonstrate the importance of actively involving individuals in decisions which affect them. Educational research indicates that when parents of school children

are involved in the process of education, their children are likely to achieve better. This heightened achievement may be due to the lessening of distance between the goals of the schools and the goals of the home and to the positive changes in teachers' attitudes resulting from their greater sense of accountability when the parents of their students are visible in the schools. The child may also achieve better because he has an increased sense of control over his own destiny when he sees his parents actively engaged in decision-making in his school. Very important, out of the heightened community integrity and ethnic group self-esteem which can be enhanced through parent and community groups effecting educational changes, the child will have a greater sense of his own worth, which is essential if he is to achieve.

Bibliography

Acton Society Trust. Size and morale. London, 1953. (As quoted in Barker and Gump)

Barker, Roger G.; and Gump, Paul V. Big school, small school. California: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Becker, Howard S. "The teacher in the authority system of the public school." The Journal of Educational Sociology, 27:128-141, November 1953.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; and others. Self-concept of ability and school achievement (II). East Lansing: Bureau of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1965.

Chesler, Mark; and others. "The principal's role in facilitating innovations." Theory into Practice,2(5):269-277, 1963.

Chilman, Catherine. Growing up poor. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Cillié, François S. Centralization or decentralization: a study in educational adaptation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940.

Cloward, Richard A.; and Jones, James A. Social class: educational attitudes and participation. In: Education in depressed areas, edited by A.H. Passow. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. p.190-216.

Coch, Lester; and French, John R.P., Jr. "Overcoming resistance to change." Human Relations, 1:512-532, 1948. (As quoted in Verba)

Coleman, James S. The struggle for control of education. Paper prepared for a symposium on Social Policy: Local Control of Education, Saskatchewan, Canada, October 1967.

Coleman, James S.; and others. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1966.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The genius of American education. New York: Vintage, 1965.

Faw, V. "A psychotherapeutic method of teaching psychology." American Psychologist, 4:104-109, 1949.

Flanders, Ned A. "Personal-social anxiety as a factor in experimental learning situations." Journal of Educational Research, 45: 100-110, 1951.

Flizak, Christopher W. Organizational structure of schools and its relationship to teachers' psychological, sociological and educational role orientation. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1967.

French, John R.P., Jr.; and others. "An experiment in participation in a Norwegian factory." Human Relations, 13:3-19, 1960.

Gaarder, Bruce. Education of American Indian children. El Paso: Annual Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, Texas, 1967.

Gittell, Marilyn. Participants and participation: a study of school policy in New York City. New York: Center for Urban Education, 1965.

Graves, Frank P. Report of a study of New York City schools. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1933.

Greeley, Andrew M.; and Rossi, Peter H. The education of Catholic Americans. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Griffiths, Daniel E. "The elementary school principal and change in the school system." Theory into Practice, 2(5):278-284, December 1963.

Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., New York. Youth in the ghetto: a study of the consequences of powerlessness and a blueprint for change. 1964.

Hess, Robert D.; and Shipman, Virginia C. Maternal attitude toward the school and the role of pupil: some social class comparisons. Paper prepared for the Fifth Work Conference on Curriculum and Teaching in Depressed Urban Areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

Hicks, Alvin Wesley. A plan to accelerate the process of adaptation in a New York City school community: the report of a Type B Project. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942.

Hornstein, Harvey A.; and others. Influence and satisfaction in organizations: a replication. (In press)

Indik, B.P. Organization size and member participation. Paper presented at American Psychology Association, New York, September 1961. (As quoted in Barker and Gump)

Jablonsky, Adelaide. "Some trends in education of the disadvantaged." IRCD Bulletin, 4(2):1-11, March 1968.

Jansen, William. The social agencies and public education in New York City. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940.

Kerr, Norman D. (pseudonym) "The school board as an agency of legitimation." Sociology in Education, 38(1):34-54, 1964.

Lander, Bernard. Towards an understanding of juvenile delinquency. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Leggett, Stanton Frank; and Vincent, William S. A program for meeting the needs of New York City schools. New York: Public Education Association, 1947.

Lewin, Kurt; and others. "Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally designed social climates." Journal of Social Psychology, 10:271-299, 1939.

Marriot, R. "Size of working group and output." Occupational Psychology, 23:47-57, 1949. (As quoted in Barker and Gump)

Minar, David W. School, community, and politics in suburban areas. In: Education in urban society, edited by B.J. Chandler and others. New York: Dodd and Mead, 1962, p.90-104.

Mort, Paul R.; and Cornell, Francis G. American schools in transition: how our schools adapt their practices to changing needs. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

Mort, Paul R.; and Vincent, William S. A look at our schools: a book for the thinking citizen. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Cattell and Company, 1946.

New York State Education Department, Albany, Bureau of School and Cultural Research. Historical review of studies and proposals relative to decentralization of administration in the New York City public school system. June 1967.

Rankin, Paul T., Jr. The relationship between parent behavior and achievement of inner-city elementary school children. Paper presented at the 1967 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, February 18, 1967.

Roessel, Robert A., Jr. "The right to be wrong and the right to be right." Journal of American Indian Education, 7(2):1-6, January 1968.

Rosenthal, Robert; and Jacobson, Lenore. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Ross, Donald H. (ed.) Administration for adaptability. New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1958.

St. John, Nancy H. Minority group performance under various conditions of school, ethnic, and economic integration: a review of research. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged, Yeshiva University, August 1968.

Schiff, Herbert Jerome. The effect of personal contactual relationships on parents' attitudes toward participation in local school affairs. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1963)

Seasholes, Bradbury. Political socialization of Negroes: image development of self and polity. In: Negro self-concept: implications for school and citizenship, by William C. Kvaraceus; and others. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1965. p.52-90.

Simon, Herbert. Recent advances in organization theory. In: Research frontiers in politics and government, by Stephen K. Bailey; and others. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1955. pp.23-44. (As quoted in Verba)

Tallachi, S. "Organization size, individual attitudes and behavior: an empirical study." Administrative Science Quarterly, 5:134-137, 1960. (As quoted in Barker and Gump)

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington D.C. Racial isolation in the public schools. Volume II, Appendices, 1967.

Verba, Sidney. Small groups and political behavior: a study of leadership. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Westby, Cleve O. Local autonomy for school communities in cities: an inquiry into educational potentials, channels of communications and leeway for local action. New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947.

Willower, Donald J. "Barriers to change in educational organizations." Theory into Practice, 2(5):257-263, 1963.

Zigler, Edward. Mental retardation: current issues and approaches. In: Review of child development research, edited by Lois Wladis Hoffman; and Martin L. Hoffman. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1966. p.107-168.